REMARKS

Applicant intends this response to be a complete response to the Examiner's 19

October 2004 Non-Final Office Action. Applicant has labeled the paragraphs in his

response to correspond to the paragraph labeling in the Office Action for the convenience

of the Examiner.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7-10, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Knijpstra U.S. Patent 5,558,581. Applicant traverses and respectfully requests

reconsideration based on the above claim amendments, if any, and the remarks presented

herein.

Applicant has amended independent claims 7 and 17 to incorporate the allowable

subject matter of claims 18 and 20, rendering the obviousness rejection moot.

Claims 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Knijpstra U.S. Patent 5,558,581 in view of Henique et al. U.S. Patent 5,582,518. Applicant

traverses and respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments,

if any, and the remarks presented herein.

Applicant has amended independent claim 11 to incorporate the allowable subject

matter of claims 18 and 20, rendering the obviousness rejection moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 18 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and ay intervening claim.

Claim 21 is allowed.

Having fully responded to the Examiner's Non-Final Office Action, Applicant

respectfully urges that is application be passed onto allowance.

Page 7

If it would be of assistance in resolving any issues in this application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact applicant's attorney Robert W. Strozier at 713.977.7000

Ī

Date: 27 December 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Ruhand H. Alsenz.

Page 8